



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS,
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/506,362	02/16/2000	David Clive Williams	49592 (1878)	6693

7590 09/25/2002

EDWARDS & ANGELL
Dike Bronstein Roberts & Cushman
Intellectual Property Practice Group
P.O. Box 9169
Boston, MA 02209

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

FORD, JOHN M

[REDACTED] ART UNIT

[REDACTED] PAPER NUMBER

1624

DATE MAILED: 09/25/2002

LO

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No. <i>09/506362</i>	Applicant(s) <i>William E. Ford</i>
Examiner <i>JM Ford</i>	Group Art Unit <i>1624</i>

—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address—

Period for Response

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE IS SET TO EXPIRE *THREE* MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a response be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for response specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a response within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for response is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication .
- Failure to respond within the set or extended period for response will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Status

- Responsive to communication(s) filed on *Sept 7, 2002*.
- This action is **FINAL**.
- Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- Claim(s) _____ is/are pending in the application.
- Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- Claim(s) *33 -- 38* is/are allowed.
- Claim(s) *39 -- 42* is/are rejected.
- Claim(s) *43 and 44* is/are objected to.
- Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

- See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.
- The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is approved disapproved.
- The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)

Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

All Some* None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been received.

- received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.
- received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____.

Attachment(s)

- Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____ Interview Summary, PTO-413
- Notice of References Cited, PTO-892 Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152
- Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948 Other _____

Office Action Summary

Art Unit: 1624

Applicants response of September 9, 2002, is noted.

The claims in the application are claims 33--44.

Claims 33--38 are allowed.

Claims 40--42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, 1st paragraph. The treatment of all cancerous cell by any one compound is not believable. See *In re Hozumi*, 226 USPQ 353.

Claims 43 and 44 would be allowed, if presented in independent form.

Claim 39 is improperly multiply dependent. Please insert "any one of" before "claims 33--38" 35 U.S.C. 112, 5th paragraph.

Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

The utility of a process for producing remissions in patients suffering from chronic myeloid leukemia was established by clinical reports and data, the acceptance of the drug employed by the Food and Drug Administration and by the American Medical Association Council on Pharmacy, the Board noting that remission, not cures, were alleged in the specification; *Ex parte Timmis*, (POBA 1959) 123 USPQ 581. Evidence involving a single compound and two types of cancer, was held insufficient to establish the utility of claims directed to a method of treating seven cancers; *In re Butting*, (CCPA 1969) 418 F2d, 163 USPQ 689.

John M. Ford:jmr

September 23, 2002



JOHN M FORD
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP ART UNIT 1624